

1
2
3
4
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 STEVE DALE PERCELLE,

No. C -12-05343 TEH (EDL)

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER ON MOTION TO MAINTAIN
REDACTIONS (DKT. 78)**

10 v.

11 S. PEARSON, et al.,

12 Defendants.
13 _____/

14 Defendants brought this motion to maintain redactions and confidentiality designations in
15 documents they produced to Plaintiff bearing bates numbers AG000020-159 (“Gang Validation
16 Package”). On July 8, 2014, the Court held a hearing at which Defendants agreed to, and the Court
17 ordered, the production to Plaintiff of the names of the author and reviewer of the debriefing report
18 contained within the Gang Validation Package, pursuant to the designation of “CONFIDENTIAL -
19 ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY.” The Court also ordered further briefing from both Parties. (Dkt.
20 106.)

21 Upon consideration of all the briefing submitted to the Court, oral argument, and in-camera
22 review of the Gang Validation Package, the Court finds that Defendants’ redactions to the Gang
23 Validation Package are proper because they are necessary to safeguard the identity of the
24 confidential informant and other individuals referenced in the document. (See Dkt. 77 (stipulated
25 protective order requiring the redaction of “information of all non-Plaintiff inmates or parolees”).)
26 As Defendants persuasively argue, the disclosure of this information could jeopardize the safety of
27 these individuals. In so holding, the Court “in no way suggests that Plaintiffs’ counsel would reveal
28 the identity of these individuals to their client. The [C]ourt only recognizes that accidental
disclosures can happen and that the identity of these persons must be afforded the greatest

1 protection.” Ashker v. Cate, No. 09-CV-5796 CW (NJV), 2013 WL 4026971, at *3 (N.D. Cal. July
2 12, 2013).

3 Defendants’ motion is hereby GRANTED. Defendants’ redactions to documents bearing
4 bates numbers AG000020-159 shall be maintained. Defendants’ designation of document
5 AG000030 as “Confidential” shall be maintained. Finally, Defendants’ designation of documents
6 AG000033-159 as “CONFIDENTIAL - ATTORNEY’S EYES ONLY” shall be maintained.

7
8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 Dated: July 28, 2014

11 
12 ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
13 United States Chief Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28